

# REMARKS

OF

HON. LYMAN TRUMBULL, OF ILLINOIS,

IN THE SENATE, JANUARY 7, 1859,

*On the motion to recommit the bill for the construction of a Pacific railroad, with instructions to bring in a bill for the construction of a Northern and Southern road, and in reply to Hon. A. Iverson.*

Mr. PRESIDENT: I am one of those favorable to the construction of a railroad to the Pacific ocean, and favorable to the granting by the Federal Government of whatever aid is necessary to accomplish the object. I shall not stop to argue the constitutionality of a measure of this character, which is a measure to provide for the common defence, to promote the general welfare, and to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity. It cannot be that a measure designed to carry out the very objects for which the Constitution was formed, is in conflict with that instrument. Nor shall I undertake to point out the importance of this great work. That has been done by others, and it would be a work of supererogation on my part now to attempt to point out the advantages in a domestic point of view to our own people, and the great advantages to accrue to this country in its foreign intercourse with the other nations of the earth, from the construction of this great work across the continent. It would facilitate intercourse with those eastern nations now for the first time about to be freely opened to the civilized world, and whose trade and wealth have excited the cupidity of European nations from the earliest times. It would be the means of transporting into the heart of the country, and across the continent, the commerce and the riches of the East, which contribute so largely to the wealth and importance of the enlightened nations of Europe.

But, as to the construction of this road, if but one road is to be built, as has been justly said, it should be a central one, a road that will accommodate most of the population and business of the country. We do not want a road where no one lives, but where the business and population of the country are; and all parties, it seems to me, from all sections of the country, should unite in favor of that great national route which will

accommodate to the greatest extent our population and the business of the country. I am very well satisfied to commence the road on the Missouri river between the mouths of the Big Sioux and Kansas rivers, as provided in this bill. I think a road commencing between those termini on the east, and terminating on the Pacific at San Francisco, and built on the most direct and eligible route between those points, would be a central road, and ought to command the support of the country.

But, sir, we have no assurance from this bill that any such road is to be built; and before I can give my vote, partial as I am to the construction of a Pacific railroad, to any bill, I must know something about where that road is to run. I do not understand the bill under consideration as some of its friends do. The Senator from California, who has this bill in charge, [Mr. GWIN,] seems to suppose that the location of the road is left to the contractors. Such is not my understanding of it. The choice of the point from which the road is to start is left to the contractors between certain limits—the mouths of the Big Sioux and Kansas rivers—but they have no authority to select the route under this bill. In looking at the remarks of the Senator from California, I find that he states that the committee were careful, in preparing this measure, to confer no discretionary power on the President or any one else. Why, sir, this bill confers all power on the President. He may carry the road where he pleases, and we have had some experience as to how this power will be exercised on the part of the executive authorities; and I will call the attention of the Senate in a moment to the way in which power is exercised, for we have had some foretaste, in the past action of the Government, of what may be expected under this bill, if it should pass in its present shape.

The bill under consideration does not give to

the contractors the right to select the route, but it directs a contract to be entered into between the President and such persons as may choose to bid for carrying the mail, from some point on the Missouri river, between the mouths of the Big Sioux and the Kansas rivers and the city of San Francisco, "on the most eligible route, reference being had to feasibility, shortness, and economy," and "whose proposal shall be deemed by him (the President) most advantageous to the United States for the full and complete performance of the said contract." Who is to determine which route is most eligible, and most advantageous to the United States? The President, to whom full discretion is left over the whole matter of the route by the provisions of this bill. After the contract is made, the party making it has authority by the terms of the bill to locate the general route of the road, but that can only mean the general route on the line selected by the President, who will doubtless refuse to make a contract unless to take the road on the route he shall deem most eligible.

Sir, we have had a little experience as to how the executive authorities use discretion of this kind. I recollect that, about two years ago, Congress passed a law authorizing the Postmaster General to contract for the conveyance of a mail "from such point on the Mississippi river as the contractors may select," (it was a little more specific than this bill,) "to San Francisco, in the State of California;" and that act provided that the Postmaster General should, before entering into the contract, "be satisfied of the ability and disposition of the parties, *bona fide* and in good faith, to perform the said contract." We all understood, when that bill was pending, and when it passed Congress, that it was to be left to the contractors to select the route by which they would take the mail across the continent to San Francisco. It would seem that, at first, the Post Office Department so understood the law; for, in the advertisement for proposals under that act, it was stated that, "besides stating the starting point on the Mississippi river, bidders will name the intermediate points proposed to be embraced in the route, and otherwise designate its course as nearly as practicable."

Under this advertisement for proposals to transport the letter mail overland to California, numerous bids were made on different routes; but what does the Postmaster General do? He rejects every bid that was made for a specific route, and adopts a route of his own. I have his official report, made at the commencement of the last session of Congress, in which he states that "the foregoing route," after stating what route he had selected, "is selected for the overland mail service to California, as combining, in my judgment, more advantages and fewer disadvantages than any other."

Now, mark what he says further: "No bid having been made for this particular route, and all the bidders whose bids were considered regular under the advertisement and the act of Congress having consented that their bids may be held and considered as extending and applying to this route," therefore, he goes on to make a con-

tract. Here the contractors were coerced, in defiance of an express act of Congress, into changing their bids to take the mail over a route indicated by the Postmaster General, or else they could not have the contract at all. Their bids were made applicable to a route which he designated; and what was that route? A route starting from the cities of St. Louis and Memphis converging in Arkansas, and running away down nearly into Mexico, over barren deserts, without water, in some instances, for more than seventy miles, and wholly incapable of settlement, thence around on to the Pacific coast, hundreds of miles south of San Francisco, and up the coast to that city—a mail route as crooked as an ox-bow, running south six parallels of latitude, and then back again six degrees of latitude to reach the place of its destination.

To justify himself for selecting this circuitous route, the Postmaster General reported to Congress that the distance to be travelled from Fulton, in Arkansas, to San Francisco, was 2,011 miles, and was about the same by that route from the Mississippi river as by any other, whereas the actual distance travelled by the mail on the route selected has turned out to be longer by hundreds of miles than the Postmaster General reported it to Congress.

Now, if under this act of Congress, passed in 1857, authorizing the Postmaster General to contract for the carrying of a mail overland from a point on the Mississippi river, to be designated by the contractors, to San Francisco, he had authority to make a contract over such a route as he should designate—and he has made such a contract, and the Government is paying for carrying the mail over that route—I ask whether the President of the United States would have any difficulty in making a contract for carrying the mail on this railroad over any route that he should think proper, provided he made the starting point between the mouths of the rivers indicated in the bill. Therefore, with the experience we have heretofore had, unless this bill is amended, partial as I am to the project of a railroad to the Pacific, I cannot vote for it. But if it be amended so as to locate the road on a line which shall be central, or nearly central, to the population and business of the country, I shall most cheerfully give it my support; and I hope the amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARLAN,] confining the road to be constructed between the parallels of thirty-seven and forty-three degrees of north latitude, may be adopted.

But, sir, I desire to call attention to the extraordinary speech of the Senator from Georgia, [Mr. IVERSON,] delivered yesterday—speech, winding up with a proposition to recommend this bill, with its various amendments, for the purpose of having a bill reported for the construction of two railroads—a Northern and a Southern road—because he looked to a separation of the Confederacy, and was unwilling to go for one road, lest in the future division of the Republic it should fall to the North; the very last reason on God's earth which would induce me to vote for two roads. Sir, I trust the day is

distant, when our legislation will be shaped with reference to a separation of the States of this Union. Has it come to this, that the basis of our legislation is to be a division? If so, I apprehend it will not be long before we have it. But, sir, I am glad that the Senator from Georgia has spoken out so boldly. He has but avowed what I have long understood to be the sentiment of the leaders of the party in power. I believe he is a fair exponent of their views; and that distinguished Senator, occupying a prominent position in the country and in this city, possessing the confidence of the Administration and the party in power—

Mr. IVERSON. Will the Senator allow me a moment?

Mr. TRUMBULL. Certainly.

Mr. IVERSON. The Senator is greatly mistaken when he says I am in the confidence of the Administration. I did not speak the sentiments of the Administration. So far as I understand them, I do not believe the Administration maintain the sentiments which I uttered yesterday. I certainly have no official or personal connection with the Administration, or any member of it, although I must state that I approve of the conduct and the general measures of the Administration.

Mr. TRUMBULL. I did not suppose, or mean to be understood as intimating, that the elaborately-prepared and carefully-written speech of the Senator had received the approbation of the Administration in advance; but he being associated with the Administration, possessing its confidence and that of the party in power, I regarded his views as a fair exposition of the views of the leaders of the so-called Democratic party of the present day. I have understood, before they were so openly and frankly avowed here, at such were their views. I supposed that they looked, as the Senator told us, to the control of this great Government in all its departments, executive, legislative, and judicial, by the slaveholding interests of the country, or to a dissolution of the Union.

Sir, how can it be that his views are not in harmony with the views of the party, maintaining the relation he does to it? I understand by the action of the party, and I have sought to show this to the country before, that they do endorse the very doctrines which he has so frankly and plainly avowed here in the Senate, and that amounts simply to this: "We will control the Government; we will disburse its revenue and dispense its patronage, and govern the North; and when we cannot do it, we will dissolve our connection with you; we will unite with you for the purpose merely of ruling and controlling you for our benefit and aggrandizement; but when the time that we can do so ceases, the Republic ceases to exist;" and when a practical measure is pending before this body, a motion is made to recommit it, for the very purpose of establishing two roads across the continent, looking to a division of the Confederacy. The Senator said yesterday:

"When the present Republican party, or its legitimate successors in some other name, shall

'get possession of the Government; when it has 'the President, both Houses of Congress, and 'the Judiciary, what will stay its hand? It cannot stand still; if it does, it dies. To live and 'reign, it must go on."

Sir, I believe that. It cannot stand still. It is a party of progress, of power. It is going on; and I coincide with the statements uttered by that Senator yesterday, that the time will come when it will take possession of the Government. It has but to pursue the even tenor of its way, standing up for the rights of free labor and free white men against the domination of the slave power, standing by the Constitution, standing by the Union, encroaching upon the rights of no section of the country, but carrying out and maintaining the principles of the Constitution, as our fathers made it. I say, it has but to go on in that course to attain power and possession of the Government, and make our Union perpetual. Further, the Senator said:

"Step by step it will be driven onward in its 'mad career, until Slavery is abolished or the 'Union dissolved. One of these two things is 'as inevitable as death."

It is by statements of this kind, as to the aims and objects of the Republican party, that the public mind of the South has been misled; and although I accord to the Senator from Georgia a fair exposition of the designs of the leaders of his party, I trust he is not a fair exponent of the public sentiment of the South, when it shall understand the position of the Republican party. Does it propose to interfere with your institution of Slavery? Where? When? When, in any of its recognised public conventions, has it ever avowed such a principle? Never. But it has placed itself on the Constitution, and on the doctrines of Jefferson, and Washington, and Monroe, and Madison, and Jackson, in regard to the Slavery question, ay, sir, and of Polk, too. It proposes to let Slavery alone, wherever it exists under State authority. It proposes to prevent its expansion into countries that are free, and where Slavery has not existed. Is that a new doctrine in this country? Why, sir, if the Senator from Georgia had occupied a seat on the floor of the Senate in 1789, when the Government was organized, and when Washington was President, and when the law passed excluding Slavery from the great Northwest, according to the creed he now avows, he must have become an advocate for disunion at once.

But, sir, the Senator made an allusion to Illinois politics, upon which I would say a word. He declared that—

"In all the late elections, conservative and 'sound Democracy, the only element sympathizing with the South, has not carried a single 'free State. I do not consider the triumph of the 'distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas] as a victory of sound Democracy. It was a 'victory of Free-Soil Democracy over Abolition 'Whiggery, and no more."

Now, sir, if the Senator from Georgia is laboring under any such misapprehension as that the great Republican party of Illinois, which has not been triumphed over, is an Abolition Whig party,

he is very much mistaken. If he is under the impression that the party sustaining my colleague is a Free-Soil Democracy, he is very much mistaken. Need I go back to the history of this country to show that parties were disrupted in 1854—the Democratic party as much as the Whig party? In 1854 was inaugurated a measure never before in issue between parties in this country, never before a party test. Immediately preceding that period, in 1852, both the then great political parties had agreed upon the Slavery question. In their National Conventions, each party had passed resolutions pledging itself to the country to abide by the settlement of the Slavery question as made in 1850, and denouncing any man as an agitator, who, under any pretence whatever, should again raise that question, in Congress or out of Congress. But, sir, what occurred within two years afterwards? Notwithstanding this pledge to the country to abide by the compromise measure of 1850, a proposition was introduced into this very body, in 1854, opening up again the whole excitement—a proposition to unsettle, not only the policy of 1850, but the policy of 1820, under which the country had acquired peace. When that new proposition was introduced to repeal the Missouri Compromise, which excluded Slavery from what now constitutes Kansas and Nebraska, persons took their positions upon that question, irrespective of former political affiliations. Parties were then formed anew upon an element never before in issue between them.

The Senator from Georgia, if he will look into the proceedings of the House of Representatives, will find that a majority of the Democratic Representatives from the North voted against the Kansas-Nebraska bill. Then it was that parties were organized upon a question which was not before in issue between them.

One of those parties, that which opposed the repeal of the Missouri Compromise and the expansion of Slavery, took the name Republican, and it is composed of persons belonging to all the previous parties—Democrats and Whigs alike. The party adhering to that measure, and pledging itself to that policy which has disturbed the peace of the country for the last four or five years, and given us more trouble than any one measure that ever passed the Congress of the United States, assumed the name Democratic—an old name applied to a new principle. Who compose its army? Is it alone those who have been Democrats? By no means.

Why, sir, I need look no further than at the distinguished members of this body, to find that the leaders and champions of this so-called Democracy were the trusted Whig leaders of old time—and Whigs now, I apprehend, for they will tell you that they have changed no principles. The transition was easy from former Whiggery to a Pro-Slavery Democracy. It required no abandonment of Whig principles. The so-called Democratic party has but one principle to-day, and what is that? The expansion of Slavery. Will they keep a Whig out of the ranks if he will endorse the Kansas-Nebraska bill? They will rather promote him to high office in the Democratic army.

An Abolitionist, or a man who has been an Abolitionist, can get into it, if he will endorse the Kansas-Nebraska bill. My friend at the right [Mr. HAMLIN] says that many of the New England Abolitionists are in it now. I could not name them all, or all the distinguished ones. I believe the late Attorney General of the United States was a distinguished example of that class, and we have many distinguished examples here of persons who were Whigs, now in full communion in the Democratic church.

The so-called Democratic party in Illinois, the "Free-Soil Democracy," as the Senator from Georgia describes it, is not made up exclusively of old Democrats. If there had not been some old Whigs and some old Know Nothings in the party, "the triumph of the distinguished Senator from Illinois," of which he spoke, would never have occurred. No, sir; there are enough Know Nothings and Whigs in the Illinois Legislature to have changed the result; and although there are many Whigs in the Republican party in Illinois, there are many Democrats in it. It is made up of both; large numbers, I am happy to say, of both, constituting a decided majority of the people of the State; and the Democratic party, so-called, not only in that State, but in all the Northern States, and the Southern States, too, is made up largely of old Whigs.

The reproach sought to be cast on the Republican party, by representing it as but an Abolition Whig party, cannot be sustained by the facts in relation to the organization of the party as it at present exists. What has become of the old Whig party of the South, which once carried many States? Is it not affiliated with and incorporated into the party with which the Senator acts? I need not go any further than his own distinguished colleague, [Mr. TOOMBS], to show him that he does not abhor altogether a affiliation with Whigs, or men who were once Whigs.

But the Senator proceeded to comment upon the doctrines of the party in Illinois, and he spoke of the Republican party as denying a right which the South is entitled to—the right to take slaves into the Territories of the United States, the common property of the Union. We do deny that the South has any such right. We deny that the Republican party makes any discrimination between the citizens of slave States and citizens of free States, as to their rights in the Territories. We deny that it advocates any doctrine leading to an inequality between the State. We would give to the citizen of Georgia the same rights in Kansas that we claim for the citizen of Illinois; but we give him none other. We deny to the citizen of Illinois the right to introduce Slavery into Kansas; we deny that right to the citizen of Georgia. They are on an equal footing. We deny to the citizen of Illinois the right to take the laws of Illinois to Kansas.

By the laws of that State, females are of full and lawful age to act for themselves at eighteen years. We deny that a female taken to Kansas by her parents has a right to avail herself of the Illinois law, and assert the rights of an adult person of lawful age at eighteen, if by the law

as the minority of females does not cease they are twenty-one; and the fact that she had ceased to be a minor at eighteen had remained in Illinois, cannot avail her in Kansas, where she becomes subject to the Territorial law upon that subject, whatever it may be in regard to Slavery. We deny the right of one who owns a slave in Georgia, by virtue of the law, (and he can hold him by virtue of the law, to take that law with him to Kansas, and hence, when he goes there, he has no right to hold the person as a slave, unless there is Territorial law to justify it.

We say that Slavery depends upon local law. The Constitution of the United States so treats the language of that instrument in regard to persons escaping from service or labor in one State into another, clearly shows this. The language is, that "persons held to service or labor in one State, under the laws thereof," and escaping into another, shall be delivered up, &c.; that is, under the laws of the State, not under the laws or Constitution of the United States. You cannot reclaim a runaway negro in any State of this Union, unless he is held as a slave by virtue of a State law. This shows that the Constitution was not intended to establish Slavery.

But, sir, if the Constitution did establish Slavery, which it does not, the Constitution has no authority in the Territories of the United States, unless Congress carries it there. That instrument was made between the States, to form a more perfect union between the States; and when the Constitution was established, it gave to the Government which was formed by it the right to govern the Territories; but it did not extend the Constitution of the United States over the Territories; nor does it extend there except by operation of law. When the Kansas-Nebraska bill was passed, Congress inserted a clause in it declaring that the Constitution of the United States should extend over Kansas and Nebraska; thus declaring that, in the opinion of Congress, the Constitution did not reach that Territory at all, unless it was made to do so by act of Congress.

The whole practice of the Government shows that to be the meaning of the Constitution. Now, sir, we appoint Judges in all the Territories of the United States; and for what length of time? For four years? What does the Constitution of the United States say? I have not told you, but it specifically declares that the Judges shall be appointed during good behavior. What right has Congress to limit the term of office of a judge in Kansas or Washington Territory to four years, under the Constitution of the United States, if that instrument extends to, and operates in, the Territories? If we appointees are Judges in the contemplation of the Constitution of the United States, then they are Judges during good behaviour, and Congress has no power to limit the tenure of their office. But Congress has done it, and it has done it upon this principle: that the Territories belong to the United States, to be governed by the Congress of the United States, irrespective of those particular requirements in that instrument

which are applicable to States alone, and not to Territories.

Congress cannot, of course, do any act in regard to a Territory which the Constitution forbids, such as to pass a law prohibiting the freedom of speech therein; but it may pass any law in regard to a Territory which it is not inhibited from passing, and which is not inconsistent with the spirit of our institutions.

But the Senator proceeded further to speak of the views of what he calls the Free-Soil Democracy of Illinois; and I quite agree with him in some remarks he made in regard to the positions put forth by that party. I quite agree with him that it is a monstrous doctrine, if the principle be once established that the Constitution carries Slavery into a Territory, that you have a right by indirection to thwart and subvert that constitutional right. Satisfy me that the Constitution of my country guarantees to an individual the right to take his slave into a Territory of the United States, and I will help, so long as I sit here under an oath to support that Constitution, to support that right. God forbid, that after laying my hand upon the Holy Scriptures, and swearing to support the Constitution of my country, I should turn around and say that, although the Constitution gives a right, I will, by unfriendly legislation, or by non-legislation, thwart and deny it. It is a position wholly untenable; and when I believe the Constitution guarantees to an individual any right, I will stand by and protect him in the exercise and enjoyment of that right. I cannot find it consistent with my conscience or my honor, or consistent with my feelings as an honest man, to undertake by indirection to thwart the very instrument which I have sworn to support. But, sir, I deny any such constitutional right as the Senator from Georgia claims. Therefore, I say that slaves cannot be taken, legitimately and constitutionally, into Kansas.

The Senator from Georgia further told us that—

"The people of the Southern States, as co-equals in the Union, and as joint and equal owners of the public territory, have the right to emigrate to these Territories with their slave property, and to the protection and the enjoyment of that property by law during the existence of the Territorial Government; laws passed by Congress as the trustee and common head of the joint property—head of all the States and all the people of the States in the public territory; laws recognising the equal right of every citizen to go in and possess and enjoy the common inheritance; laws, not to deprive men of property, but to regulate and secure its enjoyment; laws to put every man in the United States upon an equal footing in the exercise of a great constitutional right."

I agree that the people of the South are entitled to equal laws, and to laws that will put every citizen in the United States upon an equal footing in the exercise of a great constitutional right; but I do not assent to the application which the Senator from Georgia seeks to make of it, when he says that, under this general prin-

ciple, the people of the South are entitled to a law that shall protect them in holding slaves in the Territories. I say that would not be giving them equal rights, but allowing them to impose Slavery on a Territory where the people may not want it. Why has not the free citizen of the North, who emigrates to Kansas, and prefers living in a free State, where free labor is respected, as much right to insist upon keeping Slavery out of, as a man who happens to own a slave in Georgia has to insist on taking it into, the Territory? Has not the citizen of Georgia, who owns no slaves, and who emigrates to a free Territory, as good a right to insist that Slavery shall not come there, as the citizen who owns a slave in Georgia has to take him there? The interests of free white laboring men, North and South, are affected by the existence of Slavery in their midst; and after all, Slavery is participated in but by a very small proportion of the population of the United States.

There were, according to the census of 1850, about twenty million free white people in the United States. Thirteen million and more of those people resided in the free States of the North; about six million white people resided in the slaveholding States; and of those six million white people, only about three hundred and fifty thousand, something like one in twenty, of the free white population of the South, owned negroes; and yet our legislation here is to be controlled and shaped for the benefit of these three hundred and fifty thousand slaveholders, or the Union is to be dissolved. Sir, have the more than five and a half million white people in the South, and more than thirteen million white people in the North, no rights to be respected? Is Slavery to be forced upon them by the action of the Federal Government, or the Union be dissolved? Do we deny just rights to the South, when we allow the man who owns slaves, and the man who owns no slaves, the same rights and the same privileges in going to our public Territories?

But the Senator from Georgia told us, that unless he could have a law that would protect these three hundred and fifty thousand slaveholders in the holding of slaves in Kansas, he was prepared to dissolve the Union. This is his language:

"I am free to declare here, that if I had the control of the Southern people, I would demand this of Congress at the organization of every Territorial Government, as the terms upon which the South should remain in the Union. I would hold out 'right' in one hand, and 'separation' in the other, and leave the North to choose between them."

Who is going to do this? Three hundred and fifty thousand slaveholders? Surely, the five and a half million free white people in the South are not going to hold out their hands in this way, when they do not own a negro, and say, "if you do not allow us to go with our negroes into the free Territories, we will dissolve the Union." They are not going to do it. Well, who is going to do it? Three hundred and fifty thousand out of twenty million people. Why, sir, I think if

we legislate for the benefit and protection of nineteen twentieths of the people of the South, the Senator has no right to complain that legislation is shaped against the policy the South wants. But he is right, in some respects, in attaching this importance to the slave power of South. It is important, and although it is one in twenty of the white population of South, I know it controls the legislation of South. The large planter, with his numerous slaves around him, controls the labor of the country, and monopolizes the land of the country; and the white people of the South own no slaves are in a measure his dependants.

The labor which would otherwise be performed by the free hands of free men is there performed by slaves; and that labor which every man should be entitled to as his right, as the capital on which he is to live, is taken out of his hands, and given to this servile race. Exercising that control over the political institutions of the South, and over all the interests of the South, this power comes here to Washington, and, I am sorry to say, exercises a control over this General Government. Not only the five and a half million free white people of the Southern States are controlled by it, but the thirteen million people in the Northern States, where no slaves exist, are made subject to it; and we are gravely told, if this great population shall attain control of the Government; if they shall elect a President and obtain control of Congress and the various departments of the Government, then the Union is to be dissolved, and for the benefit of three hundred and fifty thousand slaveholders! I suppose the Senator from Georgia will hardly contend that the five and half million people who own no slaves in the South are benefited by Slavery.

In making this comparison, fairness would require me to say, and I wish to speak with entire candor, that although the number of slaveholders is but three hundred and fifty thousand, yet more persons are probably interested in Slavery than that, because the slaves are generally owned by the heads of families; and supposing a family to consist of five white persons, which suppose is a fair estimate, there would be five times three hundred and fifty thousand, or some one and three-quarters millions of the white population of the South that might be directly or indirectly interested in Slavery. The only interest the others could have would be to get rid of it, and to elevate labor in that country to a standard where it would be honorable for free white men to perform it.

The Senator, in speaking further of the public sentiment of the South, remarked:

"I venture the opinion, that in my own State so well convinced are the great mass of the people of all parties that the Anti-Slavery agitation is not to cease until the institution is destroyed, if the question was now put, whether the Southern States in a body should separate and form a Southern Confederacy, a majority would vote for the proposition."

Well, sir, I can only regret that such is the public sentiment of Georgia, but I hope and trust the Senator is mistaken; and if such a public

ment does exist there, I apprehend it exists on a false basis. It has been brought about by a misunderstanding of the public sentiment in the North, and will be corrected the moment the Republican party is in power, and has an opportunity practically to illustrate its principles. It is by the misrepresentation of its views on this prejudice has been engendered against the Southern States. The election of a President of the Republican party to dissolve this Union! Why, sir, what is the Union worth, what is a Union is it that we have, if, when a majority of the people of this country, in a constitutional form, elect one of their number President of the United States, that is to break up the Government? Does the South remain in this Union only to control it? Has she no principle, other than the principle of obtaining the spoils of office and the power and the patronage of the Government? Is she attached to it by no other ties than these? Has she no love for this Union, under which the people in all parts of the country have prospered to such an unexampled degree since its formation? Does she take no interest in this country, in its advancement, in its greatness, in its power, and only remain a part of it merely to enjoy the spoils of office? Sir, it will be time enough for the South to talk about dissolving the Union, and forming a Southern Confederacy, when the North, or the Republican party of the North, makes any aggressions upon its rights; and if it waits for that day, it will wait eternally. No such aggression is meant—none is intended. The people of the North, unlike the citizens of Georgia, are a Union-loving people; they will stand by the Union, and stand by the Constitution; and all they ask is, that it be not perverted and undermined by a party which is only willing to support them so long as they have control.

Such a party has no existence in the North. We are submitting now to an administration of the Government which we believe to be very unjust and very wrong. We have submitted to many acts which we believed to be unconstitutional, acts of usurpation, on the part of the executive officers of the Federal Government. We have seen the partial manner in which the laws of the United States are executed. We have noticed, within a few days, the fact that a cargo of negroes, kidnapped in Africa, has been brought to the Senator's own State, and landed there, to be subjected to Slavery, in defiance of the act of Congress pronouncing it piracy; and

we have seen the official organ of the Administration, here in this city, proclaiming, in an editorial article, that our institutions are a failure, so far as their ability to resist this violation of law and of the rights of humanity is concerned. These Africans have been smuggled away from their native land, and introduced into the heart of this country; and yet, so far as we know, no man engaged in this piratical act has been brought to justice. In South Carolina, the juries refuse to indict men engaged in the slave trade. What does the Federal Government do? Where were the army and navy of the United States, that the men engaged in importing Africans into Georgia could not be found and arrested? Perhaps the army is in Kansas, guarding perchance men indicted under a pretended charge of treason. Possibly it is on its way to Boston, to form a line in the streets of that city, to catch a runaway negro. Not many years ago, when a single negro escaped from bondage in order to regain his liberty, and was at large, the army and navy of the United States were called forth, the troops were brought out, the telegraph was called into requisition, and the whole power of the Government was employed to arrest and return the negro to bondage. Now, three hundred free persons, sought to be forced into bondage in defiance of the laws of the land, receive no protection from the Federal Government; but its institutions are pronounced a failure, so far as regards its ability to prevent such violations of the law.

We have seen this; the country has seen it; and although the laws in the one case for the benefit of Slavery are executed with the utmost rigor, we see no corresponding efforts to enforce the laws in favor of Freedom. Yet the people of the North are attached to the Union. Temporarily they submit to these acts, and they submit to the outrageous promulgation of opinions by judges in what is known as the Dred Scott case, upon a question not before them, because in due time they expect, in a constitutional mode, to reform and correct these abuses. When the Republican party attains power, it will not, as the Senator from Georgia supposes, make any encroachments on the rights of the South; but it will, I trust, be equally ready to enforce the laws both North and South, and to call the army and navy into requisition alike in all parts of the Republic, whenever needed for the enforcement of law, and it can be legally and constitutionally done.

WASHINGTON, D. C.  
BUELL & BLANCHARD, PRINTERS.  
1859.